REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 3, 2007. Applicant has amended claim 23. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,534 to Geiger in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,647,494 to Drews. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

With regard to the Examiner's comments regarding application of the references to individual claims 6, 12, and 17, the Examiner makes references to art not cited in the case, such as "Kavsan" (page 4, 4th line from the bottom; page 5, 2nd line from the bottom; page 7, line 5) and "England" (page 5, first sentence of last paragraph; page 6, first sentence of last paragraph). Applicants' comments herein assume that the Examiner meant to reference "Geiger" in these instances. If this is not correct, then Applicant requests that the Examiner reissue the Office Action, since Applicants have no citation to the Kavsan or England references, or how they are used in the current rejections.

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 23-27 and 29-31 are allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With regard to the §103(a) rejection, the Examiner agrees with the Applicants' contention in the previous Amendment that Geiger does not explicitly disclose reading configuration parameters from the certificate, if properly authenticated, and configuring the processing device hardware responsive to the configuration parameters. The Examiner states the Drews, however, discloses reading configuration parameters from the certificate and, if properly authenticated, configuring the processing device hardware

responsive to the configuration parameters, citing the Abstract; column 2, lines 60-67 and column 3, lines 1-6.

Applicant has read the Geiger reference several times in its entirety, with special consideration given to the passages cited by the Examiner, and respectfully disagrees that Drews discloses any configuration of the processing device hardware responsive to configuration parameters in a certificate. Applicant has found no disclosure in Drews that the configuration parameters have any effect on any hardware. The only fields specified in the configurations parameters 45 of Drews is an authorization certificate 42, which includes public and private keys and a digital signature, an authorization checkflag 44 and an instance counter (col. 2, line 52 through col.3, line19). The public/private keys and digital signature provide security information for integrity checks and authenticate sources of request messages or work order, the authorization checkflag 44 specifies whether integrity and security checks should be performed, and the instance counter 46 provides a unique numeric value each time a configuration parameter is changed. There does not appear to be any disclosure that the configuration parameters are used to configure the processing device hardware.

The only discussion about what the configuration parameters might be used to protect is described in the Background, where the unauthorized modification of the BIOS is discussed. As is explicitly stated in the Background, the BIOS is "machine code" to perform basic tasks (col. 1. lines 14-34).

Accordingly, it does not appear that Drews teaches reading configuration parameters from a certificate, if properly authenticated and configuring the processing device hardware responsive to the configuration parameters. Drews appears directed only to the protection of software files on a client computer.

Since claims 1, 6, 12 and 17 specify reading configuration parameters from a certificate, if properly authenticated, and configuring the processing device hardware

responsive to the configuration parameters, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

Claim 23 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Claim 28 has been amended to specify that a hardware component is enabled or disabled, not a feature. This aspect does not appear to be in the references cited by the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

January 3, 2008
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595